

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/721,385	LUDWIG ET AL.
	Examiner Sean Reilly	Art Unit 2153

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sean Reilly (Examiner). (3) Lester Ludwig (Inventor).
 (2) Craig Opperman (Applicant's Representative). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 June 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Banks "America Online: A Graphics Based Success Evaluation".

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant provided an in depth overview of the current invention and the Banks system. Several proposed claim amendments were discussed however no agreement was reached. Notably Examiner indicated that the feature of each conference client registering its conference capabilities with a conference server appears to overcome the prior art of record when incorporated into the current claims. The other proposed amendments may distinguish over the prior art of record however no agreement was reached and Examiner indicated that further consideration was needed. Applicant agreed to amend the claims to clarify that the claimed "communication device" and "service server" are different computing devices. Examiner agreed to wait for Applicant to submit follow up claim amendments by Tuesday June 27, 2006 before responding to Applicant's outstanding response filed April 17, 2006. .